



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/643,577

08/18/2003

Gregory J. Faanes

1376.711US1

3947

21186

7590

10/31/2008

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.

P.O. BOX 2938

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

THOMAS, SHANE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2186

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/31/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/643,577	Applicant(s) FAANES ET AL.	
	Examiner SHANE M. THOMAS	Art Unit 2186	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SHANE M. THOMAS. (3) ____.

(2) Tom Brennan. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 27 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 7, 22 and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hughes (U.S. Patent No. 6393536) and Henry (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018875).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant initiated interview to discuss possible amendments to the independent claims to overcome the rejections of record. Specifically, Applicant proposed an amendment that clarified operation of the Force Order Queue - mainly that an entry is not added to the FOQ when an incoming request misses addresses in the FOQ but also hits in the cache. Hughes and Henry do not appear to teach such a limitation.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Shane M Thomas/ Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2186	
--	--